

(b) **ACQUISITIONS.**—The Commission is authorized to acquire any work of art, historical object, document or material relating to historical matters, or exhibit for placement in the House wing of the Capitol or the House office buildings.

SEC. 6. STAFF.

The Commission shall be staffed by the Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives and shall have full supervisory powers over such Office. The Commission may also draw upon the staff support of such other employees of the House or its support agencies as may be agreed to by mutual consent.

SEC. 7. PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.

The expenses of the Commission shall be paid from money appropriated to the Office for the Bicentennial of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8. PERIODIC REPORTS.

The Commission may submit periodic reports on its activities to the House. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SEC. 9. TERMINATION.

The Commission shall cease to exist at the end of the 99th Congress, unless otherwise provided by law or resolution.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I reserve the right to object simply to make certain that I understand the procedure here. It is my understanding that this has been cleared by the minority?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, the gentleman is correct. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield and if I may respond further, the resolution is for the purpose of establishing a Commission on the Bicentenary of the U.S. House of Representatives. It has been cleared by the minority. There are no funds required for its implementation, and it is simply for the purpose of planning, directing, and consummating a program for the commemoration of the bicentenary of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. WALKER. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation, and I am particularly appreciative of his making the point that this is a resolution that requires no new funding, and that in fact any expenses that will be incurred from this will be out of the office for the bicentennial in the House of Representatives, and that that is previously appropriated money.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, the gentleman is correct. The Bicentenary Commission will be paid for and administered by funds and staff that are currently provided for.

Mr. WALKER. It is also my understanding that the representation on

the Commission is equal between the majority and the minority in this particular instance?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes, it is equal, and it is bipartisan in makeup.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A PLEA TO THE PRESIDENT TO REPUDIATE OPPRESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA

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

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus in sending a telegram to the President of the United States requesting an urgent meeting on the crisis in South Africa. Mr. President, we sought that meeting to bring you a message of deep concern about the deteriorating situation in that troubled country.

Last night the conference committee on this body and of the other body endorsed that message and called upon the Congress to pass the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. Upon passage of that legislation, Mr. President, we will call upon you to carry our message to the world, and our message is a simple one: The United States will no longer condone oppression in South Africa.

While you are sincere in your efforts to engage the South African Government in constructive dialog, that Government and the rest of the world perceive constructive engagement as tacit American approval of oppressive practices in South Africa. Mr. President, even the mere perception that Americans would tolerate South African repression is morally repugnant, and we call upon you now to repudiate that offensive misperception.

□ 1210

THE INSANITY OF APARTHEID

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to join with all my colleagues who have taken the well to challenge the insanity of apartheid, the cruelty and oppression of the reality of what is taking place in South Africa at this very moment and to raise the point that a number of my distinguished colleagues, as well as this gentleman, have asked the President of the United States for a terribly

important meeting to discuss this incredible issue.

Over the last several days we received a report that Mr. Botha of South Africa refused to meet with Bishop Desmond Tutu, but there are those of us who reside in this Chamber who have a compelling, obvious, yet not exclusive interest in what is taking place in South Africa, who have the right to expect more from our President.

We can understand ignoring Bishop Tutu in the context of the madness of South Africa, but this is ostensibly a democratic society.

The President of the United States, whether or not we agree ideologically, is the President of all the people and in my estimation has a moral, a political, and intellectual obligation to meet with all of the persons who are duly elected and respected representatives of major constituents in this country. The President has a profound obligation and, indeed, a responsibility to meet with us on this incredible issue.

USE OF OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT MAIL TO LOCATE MISSING CHILDREN

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1195) entitled "An Act to require that a portion of the mail of Congress and the executive branch include a photograph and biography of a missing child," with Senate amendments to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments to the House amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 15, of the House engrossed amendment, before "Section" insert "(1)".

Page 3, after line 18 of the House engrossed amendment, insert:

(2) Section 733 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the second sentence of the second undesignated paragraph the following: "Franks may also contain information relating to missing children as provided in section 3220 of title 39."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no objection.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SCHOOL-AGE CHILD CARE AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 60) to designate the week beginning September 1, 1985, as "National School-Age Child Care Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I unavoidably missed the vote on the rule to bring up this resolution. If I had been here, of course I would have supported it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that we are bringing up this measure under expeditious proceedings of the Rules of the House of Representatives. However, in light of the fact that this measure has been debated thoroughly by the House before and there is ample time allotted the rule and under the rules of the House for consideration of the measure, we would ask that the House proceed to adopt the rule and consider this important legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

□ 1350

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2577) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 7, 14, 23, 29, 35, 41, 45, 51, 57, 63, 65, 70, 75, 77, 87, 91, 92, 102, 109, 121, 130, 131, 132, 147, 150, 153, 164, 166, 167, 168, 178, 180, 183, 194, 199, 200, 202, 203, 204, 211, 214, 230, 234, 235, 249, 257, 258, 260, 261, 272, 289, 299, 307, 330, and 340 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 with an amendment as follows: After "legislation" at the end of the last sentence, insert: ";; except that this sentence shall not apply after May 15, 1986".

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 262 to the above-entitled bill.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1460, ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF 1985

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1460) to express the opposition of the United States to the system of

apartheid in South Africa, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 251, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference report that we are considering is an important conference report because, on its adoption, the Congress of the United States will be making a statement on behalf of the American people with regard to the deplorable situation in South Africa.

There are many ways to interpret legislative action. I just want to give my own. As far as the details of the conference report are concerned and the legislation that will be considered, as you know, the bill was overwhelmingly adopted in the House, went to the other body and at that time it did not seem that there would be any strong action taken, considering the nature of the bill that was passed in the other body.

But a series of unfortunate, but yet dramatic, events took place and the whole atmosphere changed and it became more important than ever for us to make the statement which we are making today in this bill to indicate our disassociation from the Government and the actions of the Government of South Africa.

While I recognize the limitations of economic sanctions or any kind of sanctions, I think it is proper to state that the legislation makes a moral statement that far exceeds any economic leverage, as important as economic leverage may be.

It is for that reason that I personally think that this conference report is vital and particularly appropriate at this time.

We must make it clear not only to that Government, but to the rest of the world that we are disassociating in the strongest possible way by taking this legislative action, imposing an economic sanction, to demonstrate our position.

I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. SOLARZ, The Black Caucus, the Members of the minority, my colleague, Mr. BROOMFIELD from Michigan and others who have worked very, very diligently in a real bipartisan effort to bring you a measure which all of us, or at least most of us can genuinely support even though I

know there are earnest and sincere differences of opinion as to the value of such action, that is economic sanctions.

But I dare say even though there may be disagreement or maybe differences of opinion with respect to the value of economic sanctions in bringing about a change in another government, I think there can be absolutely no difference of opinion, I would submit, on the issue that now is the time for the American people to make this moral statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has consumed 4 minutes.

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, I, too, join in offering my strong support for this bipartisan report that we have before us. We have what I call a very reasonable compromise, given the seriousness of the present situation in South Africa. While I originally opposed the House bill on this issue, much has happened in recent weeks that demands action by the House today.

I deplore the ongoing violence in South Africa and believe that sanctions are imperative and morally right. We must tell that government that America is concerned about the shameful system of apartheid in South Africa and the senseless bloodshed in that land. Pressure on South Africa cannot, however, be unilateral; we need the support of our allies if this effort is to succeed.

The report basically calls for immediate and weighty sanctions against the South African Government; Kruggerands, computers, nuclear goods, and bank loans would be affected. Additional sanctions are to be imposed in the future if no progress is made ending apartheid.

While sanctions by our country against South Africa are necessary, the cooperation of our allies in the effort is also essential and imperative. Pressure on the Government cannot be done by the United States alone. Over the years I have been a supporter of the policy of constructive engagement. That approach to our relations with South Africa has been useful and some progress has been made. The U.S. business in that country voluntarily complied with the provisions of the Sullivan code and South African blacks benefited from those efforts.

In recent months, however, the tension between groups in South Africa has increased and much senseless bloodletting has occurred. Something has to be done. I urge the Congress to pass this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only essential, I think it is morally right to do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I think that the conference agreement that was reached last night was in many respects historic for this institution and for our country. I cannot tell you how proud I was personally as an American and as a Member of this institution to see House and Senate conferees, on a totally bipartisan basis, express a commitment to move in a new direction in our relationship toward South Africa. The conference agreement that was passed, a very creative and constructive agreement, will send to South Africans an unmistakable message that, henceforth, the United States will no longer enter into an accommodation with apartheid.

We are also signaling the South African regime that if the Afrikaners attempt to maintain the system of apartheid, and if they continue to manifest the repression and brutality that we have seen so much in evidence in recent days, that they will be increasingly isolated in their relationship to the United States and to the international community and they will experience increasing economic and political costs as a consequence of that repression and that brutality.

My colleagues, there is a terrible tragedy in the making in South Africa. Unless the international community joins with forces within that country that are seeking to eliminate the system of apartheid, a bloodbath will be inevitable.

□ 1400

The white minority regime will abandon apartheid, will agree to enter into negotiations with the credible black leadership of the majority of the population, only at that point when it concludes that it has more to lose than to gain by attempting to hold on to apartheid.

Throughout the debate on sanctions, those who have resisted the imposition of sanctions have argued that they will only hurt the black population. My colleagues, there is no argument that has been advanced in this debate that is more off target.

The reality is that it has been the current ambivalence of American policy which, on the one hand, verbally condemns apartheid but, on the other, practices business as usual that has done more than anything else to compound the repression and to add to the violence. This is because the message that has been heard by the Afrikaners is that they indeed do have a free hand to do what they will. We have signaled them in advance that there was not going to be any response, no matter how repressive they

became internally and no matter how aggressive they were in their actions toward their neighboring states.

Make no mistake about it: Blacks in South Africa are themselves engaging in a policy of economic pressure and economic sanctions. They are pursuing boycotts now throughout the country, not because they wish to inflict economic hardship upon the black majority, but because they understand that it is that economic pressure, both internally and externally, that represents the only hope to avoid a massive bloodbath in South Africa.

We are in this legislation beginning to send straight signals to the South African Government. We are letting them know in advance that this system of apartheid cannot be maintained indefinitely, and it is up to the Afrikaners to take steps now to enter into negotiations with the black majority to achieve a new political order in which all citizens of South Africa will indeed be citizens of their own country, and full participants in the political system of that country.

Let me say one other thing, Mr. Speaker. There are some very profound moral issues at stake, and that is why I was so proud of my colleagues last night. And I want to pay tribute to the Republican leadership as well as the Democratic leadership, to Mr. BROOMFIELD as well as Mr. FASCELL on our side, and to the Republican as well as Democratic leaders in the Senate, for their willingness to join together in a genuinely bipartisan way.

I cannot tell you how important that unity is in terms of what we are conveying to the South Africans and to the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to speak with one voice in voting to approve the conference report.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CHALMERS WYLIE, a member of the conference committee and ranking member on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act.

The recent deterioration of events in South Africa lead me to the conclusion that the time is right to take stronger steps against the Government of South Africa. We do this with the fervent hope that our actions will aid all of the people in South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, other conferees more knowledgeable than I have and will address many important foreign policy aspects of this conference report. Since I was appointed as conferee on several sections because of my service as the ranking Republican member on the House Banking Committee, I will confine my remarks to the provisions under our jurisdiction.

First, the conferees adopted the House provision to immediately ban the importation of Krugerrands. The President may waive this ban if certain conditions are met as set forth in this conference report.

Second, the conferees agreed to a House amendment to the Senate provision which provided for the minting of U.S. gold coins to compete with the Krugerrand. This House amendment offered by my friend Mr. ANNUNZIO, the chairman of our Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee, creates four new gold coins which are both legal tender and have face values of \$50, \$25, \$10, and \$5. These coins truly will be American gold coins which should compete fiercely against the Krugerrand on the world markets. The significance of this coin is heightened by the symbols we will have on the 1-ounce gold coins; that is, a symbol of liberty on the obverse side and a family of American eagles on the reverse side.

The gold for these coins is to be acquired only from natural deposits in the United States or from the gold reserves held by the United States. All the profits from the sale of these coins are to be used for sole purpose of reducing the national debt.

Moreover, at my suggestion, Chairman ANNUNZIO graciously accepted language which states that the Secretary of the Treasury shall ensure that the minting of these gold coins will not result in any net cost to the U.S. Government.

In all fairness, I must tell my colleagues that the Treasury Department does not support these gold coins. Having said that, I have to believe that they will like the version adopted by the conferees more than the original Senate language, which provided for a legal tender coin without an assigned face value. In a letter to Senator JAKE GARN, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, dated April 19, 1985, Mrs. Katherine Ortega, Treasurer of the United States, pointed out that the unprecedented nature of the Senate proposed coin was addressed by President Reagan's Gold Commission, on which I served, which stated that the legal tender status of such gold bullion coins "could compel their acceptance by private creditors for debts or by the Treasury for taxes. Formidable problems involving profits and losses to private creditors and debtors could arise in assigning gold coins legal tender status at a fluctuating rate." Mrs. Ortega went on to say that a legal tender coin of the realm whose value would depend entirely upon the fluctuations of the precious metal market would represent a major departure from 200 years of coinage legislation.

I also should note that while nominal face values have been specified for the gold coins established by this act, the coins will be sold and traded at

their market values. Specifically, I believe that the conferees meant to prohibit frivolous litigation based upon the disparity between face value and market value. Transactions, involving these coins will be valued at market, not face, value.

Clearly, this American gold coin will give people all over the world a chance to vote with their pocketbooks in favor of an American gold coin symbolizing liberty and freedom and against the abhorrent practice of apartheid in South Africa.

For those of my colleagues who are concerned that such a gold coin will reestablish a gold standard, let me assure you that this is not the case. We already have on the books a gold coin as part of the 1984 Olympics program, and earlier this year the Congress enacted a gold coin as part of the Statue of Liberty restoration effort. The gold coin in this legislation is no different from earlier Government coins authorized by this body. The face values of the proposed coins are nominal and unrelated to the market value of the coins. Their market value is determined by their content. Thus, the so-called \$50 piece, which contains 1 troy ounce of fine gold, would be worth about \$328 at the current price of gold.

Moreover, the bill expressly provides for the sale of these coins at a price equal to the market value of the gold content of the coins, plus markup for production and marketing. The dollar value of the coin, therefore, is determined by world gold market—demand and supply—conditions, not by a conversion ratio between a specified quantity of gold and paper dollars fixed by U.S. public authorities.

As I read the amendment, it is not, therefore, inconsistent with the findings of the President's Gold Commission.

Section 15 of this report prohibits loans to the South African Government or to any corporation owned or controlled by that Government. Certain loans for educational, health, and housing facilities to help the people of South Africa are exempted. These provisions were contained in both House and Senate versions of the legislation.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there is language in this report which instructs the Export-Import Bank to take active steps to encourage the use of its programs by Africans. While not affecting the present restrictions on Eximbank transactions for South Africa, this provision will make it possible for non-white businesses to get Eximbank assistance.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this conference report. It is a timely step for this Nation to take in protest of the repugnant racial policies of South Africa.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs

and Coinage of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the conference report, and I want to commend the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. FASCELL], Mr. BROOMFIELD, and the other members of both sides of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for the outstanding job that they have done in bringing this legislation to the floor.

As you know, this legislation contains a ban on the sale of Krugerrands. It also contains provisions for the striking of a new series of U.S. gold coins, which I predict will become the most popular gold coins in the world.

Under the compromise legislation, four gold coins will be minted; a 1-ounce gold coin having a face value of \$50, ½-ounce gold coin having a face value of \$25, a ¼-ounce gold coin having a face value of \$10 and a ⅛-ounce gold coin having a face value of \$5. These coins will be legal tender.

The other body included in its legislation provisions for the gold coins, but did not assign face values or make the coins legal tender. Without such distinctions, the coins are really not coins, but medallions; or if you will, merely pieces of jewelry. But by assigning the coins value and making them legal tender, we make them much more attractive to the numismatic and investment communities. Experts around the country have told me that without legal tender face value the new U.S. coins would not sell.

While the Krugerrand does not have a face value and is quasi-legal tender, it should be noted that in recent months the sale of Krugerrands in this country has plummeted. The most popular gold piece now is the Canadian Maple Leaf, which does have a face value and is legal tender. More than three times the number of Maple Leafs are now being sold in this country compared to Krugerrands.

Not only will the new U.S. gold coins take away sales from Krugerrands, but if and when the situation in South Africa is stabilized and that country becomes a member of the international humanitarian world, the United States' coins will still be big sellers because of their legal tender status and face value requirements.

The compromise legislation further provides that rather than limiting private distribution and sales rights to a single concern, the Secretary of the Treasury shall make bulk sales at suitable discounts to any dealers, retail outlets, financial institutions, or anyone else who wants to sell the coins. Of course, the size of the discount will be determined by the number of coins purchased.

The compromise legislation also requires that the profits from the sale of these coins be used to retire the national debt. This is an important provision because I think it is the first time in the history of our Government that

we will have an ongoing program to retire the national debt. While I have sponsored legislation in the past that would call for a one-time contribution to retire the national debt, such as the proceeds from the George Washington commemorative coin, my new national debt reduction program will go on as long as gold coins are produced. And I would add, there is no such cutoff in the legislation.

The contribution to retire the national debt could be substantial. And depending on the source of the gold used for the coins, the national debt reduction could reach as high as \$300 per coin—a significant amount when you consider that other gold coins are selling in the millions in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the members of the House Banking Committee who served as conferees on the gold coin provision; particularly the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. NEAL, and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WYLIE. It is significant that both of these gentlemen were members of the Presidential Gold Commission, and both members supported strongly the legislation before us in this conference report.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. MITCHELL, who throughout the conference was a champion of the new gold coin program, and who made one of the most eloquent speeches in that conference, on the evils of apartheid, that I have heard in my 21 years in Congress.

The issuance of these coins would have no effect on the Nation's monetary policy. The coins would be legal tender for their face value, like all U.S. coins. But since the bullion content of the coins is well above the face value of the coins, the coins will not circulate. This is the same approach taken by Canada in issuing its "Maple Leaf," a 1-ounce gold bullion coin, which has a \$50 face value. That coin has been a popular bullion coin, and has had no adverse effect on Canadian monetary policy.

These coins will be handled the same way the public now treats the gold coins previously issued by the United States. Gold coins issued in the 19th and early 20th century are still legal tender and will be redeemed for their face value by the United States. None are ever presented for redemption however, since the coins' intrinsic bullion value are far in excess of their face value. The marketplace, not the face value, will determine their actual value as they are bought and sold in the public domain.

In fact, if a gold coin was presented to the United States for redemption, it would be a windfall for the Government. The coin, which would have been sold to the public for its bullion value, would be repurchased for its far lower face value. It could then be resold to the public at its bullion price.

Unlike some legal tender bullion coins issued by some other countries,

the fixed legal tender value of the coins eliminates any problem of valuation. For legal tender purposes the coins are worth the value stamped on them, regardless of the value of their bullion content. This not only avoids valuation problems in the unlikely event they are used as legal tender, but solves the problem of how to account for them for measuring the amount of money in circulation. Simple multiplication of the number issued by the face value provides the answer.

The legislation would not deplete our gold reserves. The gold for the coins would be obtained in the same manner that gold used in U.S. commemorative coins is obtained. The gold could come from stocks already held by the Treasury. If the Secretary preferred, the gold could be purchased on the open market. The determination whether to use existing stocks or to purchase additional gold would be left to the Secretary, just as current law provides. There would be no change in the Secretary's authority to maintain the U.S. gold stocks at the level deemed appropriate.

The coins will be sold to the public at a price equal to the market value of the gold or silver at the time of sale, plus the cost of minting, marketing, and distribution.

In order to provide the mint with ample time to prepare to mint and issue the coins, no coins could be sold before October 1, 1986. However, the mint could begin work on the program on October 1, 1985. This will provide sufficient leadtime to develop outstanding designs for the coins, design an appropriate and effective distribution system and mint sufficient coins for an initial inventory.

The coin program will involve no net cost to the Government. Indeed, the revenues raised by the domestic and foreign sale of these coins will constitute substantial revenue to the United States that will be used solely to reduce the national debt. And the availability of U.S. gold bullion coins will surely attract precious-metals buyers formerly dependent on foreign issues.

Over \$500 million can be generated each year by the sale of U.S. bullion coins. At the current gold price of \$327 per ounce the United States would realize a gain of \$285 per ounce since the gold is carried on the books at \$42.22 per ounce. If sales of gold coins were to average only 2 million ounces annually, a figure that is very reasonable, the United States would realize a gain of \$570 million. In a situation where even the smallest saving would strike a blow against the deficit, these earnings would be a major contribution.

The minting of these new American coins will aid in reducing our record trade deficits. The Commerce Department has estimated that over 1 billion dollars' worth of foreign gold bullion coins were imported into the United States in 1984.

Most Americans would prefer to purchase U.S. coins and this legislation will provide the coins they seek. Every year, countless individuals contact the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee asking for the United States to produce gold bullion coins. Many, if not all, of these individuals will buy an American gold bullion coin rather than a foreign bullion coin. Indeed, the coins are likely to become the standard by which all other bullion coins are measured.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who is a member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would say that there is unanimity in this Chamber and in this Congress as far as the opposition to the policy of apartheid in South Africa is concerned. Nobody likes that form of government; the racial repression that exists; we would all like to see that change.

My problem with this legislation is not that it attacks the policy of apartheid which we all abhor, but that it goes so far as to hurt the very people that it purports to help.

□ 1410

In addition to that, I think it bodes ill, in the long run, for the free world.

I would like to tell why on those two points.

First of all, banning the Krugerrand. If the free world all joins together in banning the Krugerrand, a lot of black people who work in the mines are going to lose their jobs. There are about 600,000 blacks who work in the gold mines of South Africa today. Each one of those people is responsible for feeding five other human beings. That is 3 million people who would be adversely affected if the mines were shut down.

If this legislation is passed here, and around the world the other free governments follow suit, many thousands of people are going to lose their jobs. They are not going to be able to put food on the table. The very people we want to help. Now, those people are going to be ripe for revolution. They are going to be grasping for existence, and the people who are Marxists over there, the revolutionaries who do exist and who are trying to undermine a number of governments in Africa, in addition to South Africa, are going to have their way with a lot of them. And those people are going to be very active in trying to change the governmental structure over there from what it is to a Marxist form of government.

What if that happens? If that happens, Mr. Speaker, in my view you would have, in just a matter of days or weeks, Soviet ships in those ports. What does that mean? Forty percent of the free world oil supplies go

around the Cape of Good Hope, the southern tip of Africa. And if the Soviets controlled the southern tip of Africa in a time of crisis, they could hamstring the free world as far as energy is concerned. Our NATO allies, Britain, France, all of the NATO allies, would be in jeopardy, as well as the United States of America, because many of our oil supplies come around the Cape of Good Hope as well.

In addition to that, you will see up here a number of charts that I have brought out for argument. I would like to explain what they mean. Many of the minerals that are depicted on these charts are vital to the survival of the United States of America. Platinum is one. We get 49 percent of our platinum from South Africa. Chromium, we get 55 percent of our chromium from South Africa. Manganese, we get 39 percent of our manganese from South Africa. Cobalt, 61 percent of our cobalt comes from Zimbabwe and Zaire to the United States of America, but it comes through South Africa. And 44 percent of vanadium comes through South Africa.

These minerals are vital to the military security and economic health of this country. Now, if the Soviet Union gets control of South Africa, it is going to hurt, or if one of the U.S.S.R. surrogates gets control, it is going to hurt severely the United States of America and may threaten the very existence of the free world.

You may say, "Well, what about the Soviet Union, are they dependent upon South Africa or the African Continent for their existence?"

If you look at this chart here, the second chart, it shows that the U.S.S.R. is almost independent as far as their needs are concerned. They have these minerals within the confines of the U.S.S.R. The only exception that they really have to worry about is cobalt, and they get the majority of their supply of cobalt from Cuba, one of their satellite countries.

Mr. Speaker, I think there are a lot of problems with this legislation. One of the problems, as I stated before, is the impact on the people we want to help, the blacks. But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a real risk, a real long-term risk to the free world.

Many of my colleagues have stood up here and they have said, "Well, we have to show moral leadership, the free world has to get involved, and we have to do something about it."

I agree with that. But how far do we go? We went pretty far in a country called Rhodesia. We stopped buying chromium from Rhodesia. The Soviet Union became the only market we had, and we were buying chromium produced in Rhodesia from the Soviet Union after it became Zimbabwe, and we were paying three times the price. Imagine what it would do to us if we had to deal with them on the same basis with these other vital minerals.

And, of course, you have seen what happened to Zimbabwe since they have gone Communist. The Government is headed back toward the dark ages and not into the future like it had been previously. They have a very repressive Government. Blacks are preying upon blacks. There is blood running in the streets. Now they have a one-party totalitarian Communist government. I submit to you if we follow the same train of thought that we followed in Zimbabwe, we are going to have the same thing in South Africa.

We stuck our nose into Iran, as did many other free world countries, talking about the repression over there. We got rid of the Shah all right, but look what we got in his place. The Ayotollah Khomeini.

We need to do something about the apartheid policies of South Africa; we need to put pressure upon this Government. But not the way we are talking about it in this piece of legislation. If we do it, I think we are sowing the seeds of massive revolution in that country. There will be no constructive change in the Government. We run the risk of a Marxist takeover, and it is going to bode very ill, in my opinion, for the entire free world.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the conferees for reporting out this piece of legislation, and I am glad the Congress has agreed to a package of economic sanctions against the apartheid regime in South Africa. Among the sanctions, as already has been said, is a ban on the Kruggerands, which I think is very, very important, because I do not want to see citizens of the United States of America continue to buy these gold coins that are created by near-slave labor and human suffering. But even as I applaud the actions of the Congress I cannot help but feel that more should be done to protect against the crimes in South Africa. Since the imposition of the state of emergency just 11 days ago, over 25 people have been killed and over 1,200 arrested by the South African police.

Now, to add further insult to injury, the South African Government has also today, or recently, announced that they were going to prohibit outdoor funeral services for those who happened to die of unnatural causes. This law is testimony, I believe, to the brutal policies of the South African police. If Pretoria truly wishes to defuse the tensions that often accompany such funerals, they should stop supplying the corpses for the funerals.

In light of these terrible crimes, as I said before, we need to do a great deal more. I believe that one of the things we need to do is to call for disinvestment in South Africa. Total United States disinvestment in South Africa would provide the slap in the face that

I believe South Africa needs, and I certainly would urge all of us to consider that in the very near future.

But before we reach for our calculators to come up with figures and graphs such as we have just seen on the board over there on the other side of the well, we need to examine the value of a human life; one live in dignity, in freedom, and in self rule. It is my belief that the value of a human life lived in dignity, lived in freedom, lived in self rule is far more important than the possibility of lost dollars from the sale of Kruggerands or from disinvestment. I think what we ought to join France's example of imposing strong sanctions and taking a hard line against the system of apartheid; and I strongly urge the passage of this conference report and its speedy signing by the President.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(Mr. LEACH of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make three brief points: The first relates to strategic issues, the second to coinage, and the third to moral. Strategically, some argue that our Government shouldn't stand up for abstract moral points because moral posturing tends too frequently to undercut our strategic position. Actually, the problem in South Africa is the obverse. Failure to stand up for moral principles jeopardizes U.S. national security. After all, ending apartheid is the most important foreign policy issue to the rest of sub-Saharan Africa, and these countries are in total more important than South Africa.

In addition, can there be any doubt that sometime in the not-too-distant future there will be majority rule in South Africa? Do we want to go down as the one country in the free world which, while paying lipservice to anti-apartheid sentiments, is viewed in the region and in South Africa as conducting a policy legitimatizing the very government which established and maintained apartheid? If such a perception remains the case, can we be expected to count on maintaining access to all the strategic minerals the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] identified?

Regarding coinage, it must be stressed that banning the importation of Kruggerands and offering an American gold coin alternative is both a deficit reduction measure and good for our balance of payments. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] should be commended for their efforts to craft a new gold policy that does not imply return to the gold standard but allows the average American citizen, at his or her option, to purchase and save American gold with confidence.

Finally, and most importantly, with regard to the moral issues at stake in this bill, we should all understand that ending apartheid in this century is as great a social imperative as ending slavery in the last.

The Republican Party was born a little more than a century ago in the smoldering cradle of apartheid-like conditions. All we ask of this Republican President is that he advance a foreign policy consistent with the views of the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln.

Apartheid is an issue that can't be ignored. Its meaning is too great; its results too important.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MITCHELL], without whose efforts the conference would not have been successful.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to go on record as saying that in many years of service in this House, I will remember that conference committee as one of the finest opportunities and experiences that I have had as a member of the this legislative body.

I am not going to call the names. You know what you did. You rose to the occasion, and you did so magnificently. I am just profoundly grateful that I could be a part of that.

□ 1420

In every society, we have certain rules that operate. They can be called mores, folkways, laws, and customs. But in our society and in other societies, there is something that transcends all of those things. That is called a moral imperative. That is what this legislation is, it is a moral imperative.

Those who would argue about possible political consequences down the line; those who would argue against the legislation in terms of the economic factor, forget, but were reminded by my colleague, that America took the high moral imperative when it took a position against slavery despite all those who counseled against taking that position.

They forget that time and time again we have taken a high moral position even though it might have had adverse political and economic circumstances, and that is what we have got. In this legislation we have got a moral imperative and this House must rise to the occasion and support.

There will always be those who will say the legislation is too weak or the legislation is too strong. I do not care about that. I know what I care about; I care about the courage of the conferees and the courage of this House in saying this is a moral imperative from which we will not back off; this is right for this Nation and its conscience.

Let me just say we have very few issues that we deal with in this House that transcend political partisanship. This is the one. This is the one real encounter this year, and I urge your total, total support for it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am very proud to be in the House today. This is one of our finest hours. In the spirit of Lincoln, BILL BROOMFIELD, DANTE FASCELL, I think this is a great opportunity, and I hope and dear pray that the President of the United States signs this conference report.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, this Member was disappointed not to be able to vote for the bill to impose new sanctions against South Africa that was passed by the House of Representatives a few weeks ago. I simply felt it was not responsible to support one specific element of that bill.

Indeed, the only provision that I could not support and that compelled me to vote against the bill prohibits all investment, direct or indirect, in new or existing business enterprises in South Africa. While the case for these sanctions is persuasive to some, a compelling case can also be made against such sanctions. As the Washington Post editorial said, "There is a serious, respectable, nonracist case against (this) sanction."

Last night, the conference committee resolved the differences between the two bills. The Houses agreed to impose a ban on the sale of Krugerrands in this country. The measure would also ban the sale of goods used in nuclear production and computers and bank loans to the South African Government. Dropped from the agreement was the House provision banning new investments in South Africa. Certainly I support the ban on the sale of Krugerrands because I believe prohibiting the sale of Krugerrands to be step of great symbolic and economic significance.

This will be one of this year's most important policy declarations by the United States of America. I urge the President to sign this legislation.

International pressure is rising against South Africa. France recently banned further investments in the country. The United Nations Security Council denounced the "barbarism" of apartheid, even though sanctions were

vetoed. When White House Press Liaison Larry Speakes talked about American "repugnance," he reflected a general feeling in this country. With this resolution, the voice of the United States will be clearly heard in South Africa and in the world community. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. With the imposition of the state of emergency, the South African Government has escalated the barbarity of their oppression of the black majority of the country. Urgent and meaningful action is needed from all of the nations of the civilized world. The sanctions included in this conference report are far too weak, nevertheless, we welcome this report as an important first step which will send a timely message to the Government of South Africa. We hope the President will hasten to sign this measure into law.

It is still important to note, Mr. Speaker, that events in South Africa are escalating daily. More and more deaths are occurring and more and more arrests are being made. There is no reason to believe the figures being released by the South African Government. The number of deaths each day are far greater than the body count that is being officially listed. The number of arrests is also far greater. The occupation of the black townships by storm troopers is the first step toward the conversion of these isolated townships into deadly concentration camps. There is every reason to believe that millions will be slaughtered by the racist inhuman Government of South Africa unless there is more forceful action by the civilized world under the leadership of the United States.

For the second time in one century we do not want to witness the slaughter of millions of innocent human beings. Beyond the sanctions included in this report there must be more stringent sanctions including the prohibition of all new investment in South Africa. As a matter of U.S. policy our Government should also demand that South Africa immediately release Nelson Mandela and begin negotiation with Mandela who is the only recognized leader among all segments of the South African black population. The United States must also demand that South Africa immediately establish a timetable for the granting of full political rights to all South African blacks. The time for action is now. When Hitler was committing massive atrocities against the Jews most of the world pretended they

didn't know it was happening. This time no nation can use that excuse. This time we know that new death camps are being prepared. This time we must all act before it is too late.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. Dishonesty and hypocrisy has reached a level unparalleled in the history of mankind in South Africa through the Botha regime's efforts to justify accelerated atrocities against the black majority in that rich country.

For those supporters of a policy of constructive engagement and opposing economic sanctions to have the audacity to say "it's out of our concern for the economic well being of blacks in South Africa" as a reason to oppose sanctions against the apartheid government by this great citadel of democracy is ludicrous, hypocritical, and dishonest.

A position in this respect bolsters the threats by the Botha government to fire people who join and support the fight for freedom, both economic and political. Anyone who has any knowledge of the history and growth of South Africa's apartheid regime must know and acknowledge the fact that current South African economic growth did not result from concern for the well being of the black majority, most of whom had jobs that the whites would not perform because of their laborious nature and low pay. Furthermore, the jobs were too few in number.

Who's kidding who? Release those social, political, and economic hostages who outnumber their legalized captors better than 4 to 1.

With respect to support for sanctions, we can reemploy some of our laid-off workers in the automobile, steel, and coal industries who have lost their jobs as a result of plant closings and United States investments in South Africa.

We can no longer continue down the failed path of President Reagan's constructive engagement. I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report on H.R. 1460 as a step toward the end of world recognized injustice in South Africa.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

(Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in 1978, I think it was October 1978, I rose on this floor to speak in favor of censuring the Government of South Africa, and I voted to censure South Africa at that time.

Now, we are told that since that time there has been progress in that country. I will not deny there has been some progress, but that progress has been minimal, and that progress has been largely cosmetic.

Some of my friends seem to have a strange attachment to South Africa. South Africa for some reason in their minds rises to the status of special friend. Mr. Speaker, no nation which represses its citizens and denies basic human freedoms is a friend of mine or of the principles on which this country was founded. There must be no more rationalizations. If what is happening in South Africa does not stir moral outrage, what will?

This is not an economic issue. Communist revolutions do not come from the granting of basic human freedoms. No Member of this House should vote against this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKER].

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

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I rise in support of H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act, and H.R. 2068.

Under the system of apartheid millions of South Africans have been forcefully removed from their homes and families to areas called homelands. Blacks earning only a fraction of what whites earn in the workplace—attempts to unionize being met with imprisonment—these are only a few examples of the uncivilized ways in which the South African Government treats the majority of its population who are blacks.

In the past several weeks the protests of blacks have been met with violence on the part of the South African Government. Thousands of blacks have been arrested including children as young as 8 years of age.

The bloodshed must stop. The South African Government is unwilling to meet with black civil rights leaders. Constructive engagement has not worked as a means of dealing with the South African Government. Institutionalized racism still exists and less than half of the U.S. corporations doing business in South Africa have voluntarily signed the Sullivan principles.

H.R. 2068 and H.R. 1460 will send a clear message to the Government of South Africa, and to the rest of the world, that the United States clearly will not tolerate their antihumanistic, racist, apartheid policies.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise, first of all, to commend members of the conference on both sides of the aisle for having quizzed themselves so well, valiantly

contending for the stronger measure passed by the House.

At this point, I am already looking beyond 1460, because I am confident that the Members of this House who voted for that stronger measure are going to support this as a means of sending a message to South Africa.

I am looking beyond it because when we voted on this measure back in June, no state of emergency had been established in South Africa, and 1,300 people to date have not been arrested without charge and without recourse; 25 people have not been killed as a result of that emergency.

□ 1430

Those who had been accustomed to at least providing those victims of racist, Nazi, Fascist oppression had not been denied the right to bury them in public funerals, nor had we the moral leadership which we sought to exert seized by France, and saying that we would do what the House proposes to do without delay.

So I am hopeful that as we pass this measure that we look to stronger indications to the South African Government that we will no longer cooperate with their blind march toward racism, violence, bloodshed, and ultimately destruction, but will reward them when they turn up the road toward true democracy, toward dialog, and toward full self-determination.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER], the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Africa.

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

Mr. SILJANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the violence in South Africa must stop. The bloodshed of innocent people, blacks against blacks, whites against blacks, it must stop. I, as one Member, feel that we, as the greatest Nation on the Earth, a great and free democracy that holds up high the symbols of truth and fairness and liberty and justice, that we should do all we can do, and we have a responsibility to do all we can do to encourage those who are under oppression in other countries to be released.

We call on the Government of South Africa to release the majority to become part of the political and economic and social system fully in that country. We call upon the apartheid racist regime to cease and desist in their pass laws, detention laws, and all the other apartheid laws that made that country an abomination of human rights and freedom.

All of the messages in Congress, be it the House bill, the Senate version, the conference committee report, several substitutes offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ZSCHAU], myself and others, we have all called for the dismantlement of apartheid. That concept is elementary.

I hope the Government of South Africa hears this message loudly and very, very clearly: That there is not one Member, white or black, young or old, who could possibly, by any remote stretch of the imagination, support a system that stabilizes the apartheid system in that country.

I have made the arguments against sanctions on the floor, in the subcommittee, in the full committee, and last night and through the day in conference, so I will not go through those same arguments again. I believe philosophically that sanctions are the wrong approach to prompt change in that nation. The grain embargo failed against the Soviets. Sanctions against Cuba failed, and indeed, I think the sanctions against Nicaragua will also fail. I believe that banning Krugers is merely symbolic, a symbolic gesture that they claim is against the Government, but truly it is against the people.

But I must say there are some good things about H.R. 1460, although I intend to vote against the bill. I offered mandatory Sullivan principles as an option to sanctions. On the floor it has lost, but now, with enthusiasm, both the House and the Senate are adopting the same idea. I also proposed on the floor an amendment to make the U.S. Embassy in South Africa conform to the Sullivan principles. It passed this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SILJANDER] has expired.

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SILJANDER. So that amendment is also included in this conference report.

Scholarships for black South Africans, assistance to black businesses, are also part of the Siljander substitute, which are also part of this conference report.

I think the major issue that I have found extremely offensive in the House version that passed this body was the fact that we banned all new business to South Africa. I did not believe that that would have been an effective deterrent of the apartheid system. That is the mainstay, the cornerstone, from my point of view, of the House bill. That was also taken out and not accepted in the conference report.

Democracy, I hope, will be the option, as we are hoping it will be in Angola with the successful repeal of the Clark amendment, and a repeal of military aid to Mozambique.

So the Africa policy in the last 6 to 8 months, from this gentleman's point of view, has been quite successful. I hope South Africa will change and will change very, very soon. This provision, in my opinion, will not fully engage change as necessary, so I intend to vote against the provision, but regardless of what happens in this House

and in the Senate, and what the President finally decides ultimately to do, I hope and pray that apartheid will change and that people will be free. Let us hope and pray.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY].

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

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Mr. Speaker, symbolizing justice and humanity to much of the world, America must act, and do it quickly, to bring comfort and support to South Africa's antiapartheid movement. This Government's continuing debate over the proper course of action has only encouraged the current regime in South Africa. Indeed, our collaboration is clear. President Botha's recent declaration of the state of emergency constitutes a deliberate plan to decapitate the antiapartheid movement. While the Johannesburg police detained 1,000 blacks, the Reagan administration announced that this action fails to warrant a shift in constructive engagement with the Botha government. Carel Boshoff, the chairman of the rightwing Afrikaner secret society, Broederbond, even praised the Reagan administration last week for not interfering in South African affairs. This is the same man who has claimed that only white salvation will bring peace to South Africa. The same man who predicts that in a race war, South Africa's blacks will be no match against the minority white society. The same man who claims that the black threat to South Africa reminds him of the Jewish threat to Germany.

Mr. Speaker, our association with South Africa is against our best interests. Let us welcome a new, just approach, embrace the antiapartheid movement, and support the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CROCKETT].

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

Mr. CROCKETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great sense of pride on this occasion. The chairman of my committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is from my native State of Florida, and he has expressed what I believe is the majority sentiment of this country with respect to what is happening in South Africa.

Both the ranking minority member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and the chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLFE], are colleagues of mine from the State of Michigan, so the

State of Michigan itself is proud of the bipartisan contribution these two sons of Michigan have made.

I have no illusions, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of this conference report is going to immediately bring about changes in South Africa. I think by and large the conference report, on which I had the honor to serve as a conferee, is essentially symbolic, but I expect it to do two things:

First, to convince all doubters that the majority of the American people believe that the administration's policy of constructive engagement has been a dismal failure.

Second, to carry home to the new rulers of South Africa, to the Bishop Tutu's, to the Nelson Mandela's, and to the others who represent the future rulers of that great country, the clear message that the people of the United States are behind them in their fight for liberation.

I commend the conference report to my colleagues.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. JERRY LEWIS.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would really like, in my short time, to attempt to make a couple of points.

The first relates to the general issue itself, the conference report that is before us. Frankly, as I sat and listened earlier to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], express his concerns, I could not help but want to recognize that, indeed, in this very delicate circumstance I can understand why a public policy maker would have concerns of that kind.

Having said that, it is my view that the House owes a deep debt of gratitude to Chairman DANTE FASCELL, and to my ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], for dealing with this very, very difficult circumstance. It has got to be clear to anybody who will but take a look that the difficulties in South Africa are difficulties that we cannot ignore.

□ 1440

When we have a circumstance in which at least two-thirds of the people of a country are not given even the basic vestige of what we know as civil rights in this country, indeed we know that circumstance is going to change. For once, as America attempts to take the side of that which is morally correct, let us hope our policy allows us, as that change takes place, to land on the right side of the curve, because we have a fundamental and critical interest in South Africa.

Having said that, let me say that I attended the conference for another purpose, not as a member of the conference but, rather, to deal with the issue of whether America should participate in this process by way of issuing American gold coins. I want to express my deep appreciation to my col-

league, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], for his great cooperation and making possible the progress we have made in connection with that work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has expired.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional one-half minute to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want every Member of this House to know the important role that the gentleman from California has played in the gold coin portion of this legislation.

Much of the gold coin provision which we are voting on today was taken from H.R. 1123, introduced on February 19 by Mr. LEWIS, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], and 237 other Members of the House.

It was the hard work and tireless efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] that provided the push for the Gold Coin Program. And while I had differences in the technical aspects of the legislation, I never for 1 minute had a difference with the gentleman from California for the laudable purposes of the legislation.

Had the conference not addressed the gold coin issue at this time, the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee, which I chair, was scheduled to hold hearings on the gentleman's legislation in September. And I am certain that the committee would have reported the legislation and it would have passed the House floor.

So while the conference did not directly pass the Lewis bill, it did pass the Lewis principle. The gentleman from California deserves the plaudits of every Member of the House as well as everyone in this country who was interested in a Gold Coin Program.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], for his comments.

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

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

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I rise in strong support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the events of the past several weeks have awakened us to the fact that the situation in South Africa can no longer be ignored and can no longer be swept under the rug through a policy of constructive engagement.

For years the administration has been promising us that if we just went along with a policy of friendly persuasion, things would begin to improve. We have continued to receive assurances from the White House that things were improving. The events of recent weeks have shown that this is simply not the case.

The state of emergency imposed by the government in Pretoria is vivid evidence that that the situation is not only not getting better but is in fact getting worse. Whatever few human rights the black population of South Africa had have been brutally revoked by this desperate move.

As the leader of the free world, this Nation can no longer sit quietly by and while a government that has enjoyed our support becomes increasingly oppressive. The time has come to remove our heads from the sand and recognize that our policy of constructive engagement has been a failure. The time has come to impose severe and meaningful sanctions against South Africa, ones that will forcefully demonstrate our disdain for their blatant violation of human rights.

I stand today in support of the measures this Congress is considering against South Africa. How many times can we afford to stand by and allow the Communists to exploit an intolerable situation to their own advantage while we do nothing? Haven't we learned from bitter experience what can result when people of good will and fine intentions close their eyes to brutality?

There is still time for us to act. The blood of innocent people has already begun to flow in South Africa, and unless the civilized world is prepared to stand up and demand that it be stopped, I am afraid that the results will be tragic.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take action now. Perhaps if the government in Pretoria is finally convinced that we are serious about our opposition to their actions they will begin to take respect for human rights seriously. As we voted for the original legislation, we must now support this conference report.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I speak with honor and pride today that I am a Member of this House which is considering the conference report on H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act, which I have cosponsored.

My regret is that the Congress did not adopt this legislation last year. Although the House adopted a similar

bill, the Senate did not do so. If the Congress had taken a stand, perhaps lives in South Africa would have been saved. Perhaps we would not be witnessing the dire situation which exists in South Africa today.

In speaking in favor of the legislation when the House debated it in June, I said that we must realize the long-term implications of our present relationship with South Africa. I said that most people agree that the walls of apartheid will be torn down, and that most people agree that the longer the walls remain standing, the more violent will be the means to bring them down. We are now witnessing that violence. We must not delay another day in taking a stand for our Government against the evil of apartheid.

The legislation which we have before us today clearly demonstrates our distaste for apartheid. It takes important steps to end our country's financial support for the South African system. In the legislation: We end bank loans to South Africa, we prohibit the importation of South African gold coins, we prohibit the sale of computer equipment to South Africa and we seek to end new investment by American companies in South Africa unless there is significant change in the apartheid system.

Some say that this legislation is not enough. That we must end all American investment in South Africa. That is true. We can continue to work toward that goal, and if no progress occurs implement such a policy. But the legislation which we have before us today is an excellent start. It ends our country's misguided policy of "constructive engagement" and in its place makes clear that we have no tolerance for the immoral system of apartheid.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this legislation. I am honored to vote to bring freedom and justice to all of the people of South Africa.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DeWINE], who signed the conference report.

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

Mr. DeWINE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in very strong support of this measure, which is long overdue, to bring justice and equal opportunity to South Africa. I commend the leadership of our Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Subcommittee on Africa for bringing this measure to the floor before we recess and, hopefully, in time to save additional lives.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that all of my colleagues will be able to support this legislation, an important step in the increased American pressure that

should be brought against the South African Government in an effort to persuade it to end its current harsh, discriminatory policies.

The recent events in South Africa emphasize the need for this legislation. Some forces in South Africa will use the present unrest as an excuse to press for the repeal of the modest reforms that have been made up to this date. We must speak to those forces, and let them know that we expect progress, not reaction, in the face of current tensions. Obviously, the system in South Africa cannot be changed overnight. But we expect measured, real change to come about.

This bill provides immediate sanctions in the form of a cutoff of loans to the South African Government, a banning of the importation of Krugers, and a halt to shipments of computers to that country. The bill calls for increasing sanctions in the months and years ahead if South Africa fails to heed the call of the international community and the great majority of its own people and if it fails to undertake serious reforms.

I was pleased to support the original bill when it came to the House floor, and I am happy to support this compromise version of the legislation.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill when it came on the House floor. I voted against it in committee and subcommittee. But last night I signed the conference committee report.

Make no mistake about it, this is a much superior bill than the one we sent out of this House, and it is superior for several reasons. First of all, it does have mandatory Sullivan principles in it. It allows the United States to continue and to expand its constructive role in South Africa. It has mandatory Sullivan principles for all U.S. companies doing business in South Africa.

The second main reason that I am supporting this bill is because the House bill was all front loaded. It did everything right away. This bill is a much more reasoned, logical approach. It does a few things at first, and then it tells the Government of South Africa, "This is what we are going to do, and this is how you can avoid it if you will grant some very basic, elementary human rights."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report. I urge my President to sign the bill. It is a good bill, it is a constructive bill. No one on either side of the aisle knows, frankly, what good this bill will do. We do not honestly know. Sometimes I think both sides overestimate our ability to control events in South Africa, but it is right that we try, and this is the right bill to do it with.

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, very quickly, I would like to say that from

the magic moments when Randall Robinson and our colleague, the gentleman from the District of Columbia, Mr. WALTER FAUNTROY, started the demonstrations in front of the South African Embassy, to the point where so many of us demonstrated in front of that embassy, to the magic moment yesterday when in fact I was honored to be one of the conferees to sign that conference report, I have believed that peaceful and constructive and meaningful demonstrations can bring about change, and I think that was the product of yesterday's debate.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was a Member who offered one of the two substitutes considered by this Congress when this issue was before us at an earlier point in time, and I, too, am happy today to stand and urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Let me point out what we have included in this particular package. I want to commend those Members on both sides of the aisle of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Banking Committee for an outstanding job of bringing about a bipartisan program for justice in South Africa. That is what this is. It is the positive action that we talked about, with Sullivan proposals, the scholarships for the blacks, and the conditional investment as well.

I consider that positive because it says there are certain things we are going to do today. We are going to tell the Government of South Africa, "Clean up your act. Bring justice to all your people or a year from now we are going to take tougher actions. But you be the judge."

What we are really doing today, then, is we are going beyond the positive actions of conditional investment and the positive actions I have mentioned to include some sanctions, something many of us on our side of the aisle opposed earlier. Why should we do that today? I believe that the sanctions included in this bill are a legitimate response to the state of emergency and the actions that are occurring by the South African Government today, and I say that it would be wrong for the greatest free republic in the world to not have some kind of response for the rest of the world to know that we still are the bastion of freedom and we want to send that signal to the world, that bipartisan plan for justice.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing today. I commend my colleagues for this action, and I join with them in their very positive action on this particular proposal.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the principal sponsors of this bill, the gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York. Throughout their long and distinguished careers in this body, they have worked tirelessly for a just and humane policy toward South Africa. We are deeply indebted to them for dedicating so much of their enormous talent, their unbounded energy and their great wisdom to this cause.

The sanctions in this bill will not force the South African Government to immediately grant equal rights to blacks.

But those who rule in South Africa should understand the bill's full meaning.

It means that the United States has joined the peaceful protest against apartheid—we will use nonviolent pressure to hasten the end of racial domination.

And this bill means that we do not regard the oppressors in South Africa as allies. Their rigid adherence to apartheid is the best friend the Soviet Union has in Africa.

One of the bill's sanctions—the restriction on computer sales to the South African Government—directly affects the enforcement of apartheid.

As the originator of the ban on computer sales to the South African Government which the House passed in the Anti-Apartheid Act, and as the conferee who negotiated the compromise which appears in this bill, I would like to comment on the computer sanctions.

These are significant new restrictions on computer sales to the South African Government. They close huge loopholes in current regulations.

It is important to note that the sanctions apply to all future sales of computers, software or goods or technology intended to service computers—whether or not such sales may be subject to long-term contracts or leasing arrangements. Explicit language in the House bill applied the sanctions to existing contracts. This was dropped in conference only because it was no longer necessary. The House bill amended the Export Administration Act, which contains a contract sanctity provision exempting contracted exports from foreign policy controls. The computer sanctions in this bill are free standing. They do not fall under the Export Administration Act, and therefore need no special provision to assure that they apply to all exports, whether subject to a contract or not.

The bill imposes a total ban on computer sales to South Africa's military, police and apartheid-enforcing agencies.

The ban applies to sales of all computers of any size. Current regulations, by contrast, impose no controls on personal computer sales to South

Africa's police or apartheid-enforcing agencies. Exceptions for personal computers are inappropriate in the South African context. Any personal computer can be outfitted with a hard disk with a memory of 2,000 pages, or, using a modem, can become a terminal for a mainframe and have access to its memory bank. The South African Government can use personal computers in local and regional offices, as well as central government mainframe computers, to enforce controls on blacks.

The sanctions explicitly cover software and servicing for American computers already owned by the South African Government. Current regulations exempt from controls software and servicing for goods previously licensed.

The ban on sales to the military, police and apartheid-enforcing agencies covers all computer sales for any purpose. Current regulations allow computer sales to these entities if it is somehow determined that the computer will not contribute significantly to security or apartheid functions.

Finally, all computers sold to any entity of the South African Government are subject to the end use verification requirement. The verification procedures must be adequate to assure the computers are not used for police, military or apartheid-enforcing purposes. Currently, there are no such controls over computers sold to most agencies of the South African Government.

Mr. Speaker, I was disturbed by the active lobbying which some computer companies did to minimize restrictions on computer sales to the South African Government—particularly Control Data, IBM, and Hewlett-Packard.

To be fair, these companies argued from the beginning that they did not wish to sell new computers to South Africa's military, police, or apartheid-enforcing agencies. But they did want to continue to serve and provide software for computers previously sold or leased to these agencies. They insisted on continuing to sell to other agencies of the South African Government—even those which do not in any way benefit blacks.

As far as I know, computer industry spokesmen were the only business representatives who mounted an active campaign against sanctions in this bill. Their actions are surprising, given that their product contributes so directly to apartheid, and sales to the South African Government represent such a tiny fraction of their worldwide profit.

Recall that when some American companies unknowingly contracted to sell nerve gas chemicals to Iraq, those companies appealed to the Government for sanctions to relieve them from any obligation to fulfill the nerve gas contracts. I would have thought that American computer companies would take a similar view of their busi-

ness with the South African Government. A total ban on computer sales to the Government would relieve them of any obligation to sell a computer that might be used to oppress blacks.

Were it not for computer company lobbying, this bill might have contained the original House ban on all computer sales to the South African Government. It would have been much stronger. Even though this bill requires verification procedures, it is going to be very difficult to prevent the South African Government from using any computer at its disposal to maintain controls over the daily lives of blacks.

I would urge the computer companies voluntarily to halt all sales to the South African Government, following the example of American banks. Some things are more important than profits.

If the computer companies are determined to sell the South African Government, I would note that much of the burden for end use verification will fall on their shoulders. I would urge them to be thorough and conscientious to assure there is no diversion of their computers to use in enforcing apartheid.

Finally, I would note that the Statement of Managers urges computer companies not to sell computers of any size to South African Government agencies which provide no services to nonwhites. Although the law prohibits only sales above \$100,000 to such agencies, I would urge the companies to sell computers only to government entities which provide valuable services to blacks in South Africa.

□ 1450

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ZSCHAU], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

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

Mr. ZSCHAU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. I want to commend the conferees and the authors of this legislation for their leadership.

When H.R. 1460 was before the House earlier this year, I voted against it. Although I supported its objective of helping to bring an end to apartheid, I felt that it contained provisions that would be counterproductive to that objective. In particular, I opposed the ban on new investment. Many U.S. companies are playing a constructive role in bringing about fair employment practices and a better life to black South Africans. These companies, which subscribe to the Sullivan principles, should be encouraged to expand and help bring about change rather than being stifled.

I offered an amendment to the House bill that would have restricted the ban on new investment to only those companies that did not abide by

the Sullivan code. My amendment was defeated. However, I'm pleased that the concept of my amendment is in this conference report. The Sullivan code is made mandatory, and there is no ban on new investment by U.S. companies.

I was also concerned about the blanket ban on computer sales to the Government of South Africa contained in the House bill. We should not be selling computers for use by the South African Government in administering apartheid. In fact, current export regulations restrict that. However, I feel that U.S. companies should be able to compete for the business of South African Government agencies that have nothing to do with the enforcement of apartheid and which provide valuable services to nonwhites as well as whites. In this conference report, the computer ban is targeted to restrict computer sales only to those agencies that enforce apartheid. That is as it should be.

This conference report, in my opinion, is a balanced and responsible action. It is important that it is balanced and responsible. However, it is essential that it is an action. The time for talk is past. The time for action is now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report, and I urge the President to sign this legislation into law.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO], a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who voted against the bill when it passed the House, but I must point out to my colleagues that this is not the same bill. In my opinion, the House-passed bill would have been counterproductive, would have done more damage than good. I think the bill as drafted by the conference committee is appropriate. It makes a statement that we should all make and I think it may well help the situation in South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to conclude the debate now on our side, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

I rise in support of this conference report. Over the last 2 hours, I have been circulating on the floor among Republican Members who voted against this bill when it left the House. A letter to the President, which I intend to read at this point, along with the signatures of the Members who have signed the letter, is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 1, 1985.

The President,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 5, 1985, the House of Representatives voted by an overwhelming margin to immediately impose economic sanctions on South Africa. Subsequently, the Senate on July 11 passed its version of sanctions against the South African government by an even larger margin. We opposed the House bill believing many of its provisions to be ineffective and counterproductive.

However, we are now prepared to support the agreement reached last night by House and Senate conferees. We believe the Conference Report to be a fair and reasonable compromise between the House and Senate positions. Furthermore, the persistent and escalating violence in South Africa requires our country to respond immediately to this crisis.

We respectfully urge you not to veto this measure because it is an important statement of U.S. policy for the future. It has bipartisan support in both Houses which is almost certainly substantial enough to override a veto. Given our strong support for this measure, we would be compelled to actively work for such an override, should it become necessary. We urge you to accept the Conference Report on H.R. 1460.

Mr. Speaker, that letter is signed by myself, MESSRS. BROOMFIELD, GINGRICH, HENRY, GUNDERSON, CRAIG, HILLIS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, MESSRS. STRANG, BEREUTER, DREIER, ZSCHAU, LAGOMARSINO, WHITTAKER, DEWINE, and COBEY.

We will have other signatures before this day is over. I expect to nearly double that number.

I think it is a signal to the President that those 127 people who voted against this bill when it left the House is not a base upon which to build a veto. In fact, that base is deteriorating.

The President ought to sign this bill. It is a good bill at a good time.

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes for purposes of closing the debate to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

(Mr. FORD of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today marks an historic beginning for the U.S. Congress. While we have always been able to battle the disgusting practice of apartheid with rhetoric, we have the opportunity today to put the U.S. Congress on record against the policies of the South African Government. I want to ask our colleagues in the other body at this time to approve the conference report to H.R. 1460. Let America again be looked upon as the primary defender of world rights and liberties.

Obviously, the legislation is a first, albeit important, step in the fight against apartheid. No one in the Con-

gress should overlook the significance of today's legislation. Unless the South African Government changes its ways, more needs to be done in the future. However, I am concerned that while the measure we have before us today may soon become law, it still might lack the full support of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, we are not the only nation with an interest in this matter. The case for bringing economic sanctions against South Africa by the international community at the United Nations is a continuing one. The world body needs the backing of the United States to pass meaningful sanctions against the South Africans. I am very concerned that the administration might not support the limited sanctions we are considering today. Such a lack of support would break the back of those advocating an end to the apartheid system. Thus, I will be introducing legislation in September which would express the sense of the Congress that this institution expects the administration to uphold these sanctions should they become law. In such a highly visible world forum as the United Nations, the potential damage that might result to the anti-apartheid movement from administration inaction is enormous.

Mr. Speaker, should H.R. 1460 become law, it must mark the end of the policy of constructive engagement. Let us not be the one nation standing in the way of social reform in South Africa. In the face of new regulations banning even outdoor funerals, I call upon the President to support this legislation, and to meet with members of the Congressional Black Caucus to hear our concerns on this matter.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, this is an extraordinarily significant achievement. For the first time since the establishment of apartheid in 1948, 37 years ago, the United States will be going on record as making clear our opposition to apartheid by deed, as well as by word.

The adoption of this conference report will send a message to the minority regime in South Africa that the United States will not continue to conduct business as usual with them in the absence of any meaningful progress for the elimination of apartheid.

It will send a message to the indigenous majority within South Africa that the United States is on the side of change, rather than on the side of the status quo in that country.

A little bit earlier, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] said that he was fearful of the consequences for the West if an unfriendly government should one day come to power in South Africa. Well, let me tell my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, and the other Members of this House, that sooner or later, the black majority in South Africa will inevitably be in a position to determine their own destiny and when that day comes, the United States will be in a much better

position to have a truly constructive relationship with South Africa if, in the interim, we have made it clear that we are on the side of change, rather than on the side of the status quo.

Mr. Speaker, I want to use this opportunity to close the debate to make a plea to the President of the United States, who has here an opportunity to create a genuine bipartisan consensus with respect to our foreign policy toward South Africa, not only a consensus among Democrats and Republicans in the Congress, but a consensus between the Congress and the executive branch itself.

We are much more effective abroad when we are united at home. How wonderful it would be if we could all stand up in the Rose Garden of the White House, Republicans and Democrats alike, together with the President of the United States, and say to South Africa and the rest of the world that the United States, at long last, is prepared to use its influence, its resources, to help bring about the elimination of apartheid in South Africa.

I would say to the President of the United States, "Mr. President, after the murder of 500 blacks in South Africa in the last year alone, most of them by the security forces of that country, after the establishment of the state of seige, after the withdrawal of the U.S. Ambassador to South Africa from Pretoria and the withdrawal of the South African Ambassador to the United States from Washington, after the establishment of sanctions against South Africa by Canada and France and the call for sanctions against South Africa unanimously by the Security Council of the United Nations, the time has come for us to finally write the obituary for the policy of constructive engagement.

"It was tried, but it did not work, and it created the impression that the United States was somehow in sympathy with the Government of South Africa without producing any meaningful progress toward the elimination of apartheid."

□ 1500

We need a new policy, the policy embodied in this conference report which calls for the elimination forthwith of apartheid in South Africa.

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with many issues today, but few are more important or timely than the adoption of this conference report. The events of the last few weeks have proven—if further proof were needed—that the Government of South Africa ruthlessly represses its black citizens. Just yesterday, new restrictions were imposed on funerals, which are the only form of political expression left to South African blacks.

Many Americans have watched in horror and frustration the deteriorating situation in South Africa. And they have asked a single question:

What is our Government, one that is founded on respect for human rights and human freedom, what is our Government doing to end this tragedy? The answer to that question is in this legislation. The measures it proposes are quite simply the least we can do.

There have been many speeches made about the situation in South Africa. But this bill speaks more loudly and more effectively than even the most eloquent words. It is our opportunity to demonstrate our commitment to racial justice and political liberties, not just at home but abroad.

Mr. Speaker, there should be no controversy about this conference report. The House has agreed to these provisions. The Senate has agreed. I hope the White House will come to agree as well. But now it is time for us to act. I urge my colleagues to adopt this conference report.●

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act, as reported by the conference committee. While this Member would have preferred to see the Congress pass the measure previously approved by the House, the compromise represented by the conference report imposes economic sanctions on South Africa and indicates the steps we are willing to take if conditions in that country do not improve.

At present, the situation in South Africa is deteriorating. The 500 dead and over 1,200 arrests in the past year, and the current state of emergency that accelerated these statistics, speak of a situation which the United States must not continue to ignore. Our current policy of constructive engagement is an embarrassment. The South African Government has graphically illustrated the fact that it is unimpressed by this country's quiet, and unenthusiastic, disapproval of apartheid. Our credibility as a nation concerned with civil rights and willing, as we have done most recently in the case of Nicaragua, to express this conviction in concrete terms is on the line here. We must, at a minimum, vote in favor of the Anti-Apartheid Act.●

● Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report on H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act. It is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

This bill imposes an immediate ban on the importation of Krugerrands, prohibits loans to the South African Government, puts limitations on exports of computers to the South African Government, and imposes limitations on the export of nuclear goods and technology.

Additional sanctions are to be imposed if, after a 12-month period, the South African Government makes no progress toward ending apartheid. The sanctions can be eased if the Government makes progress. These additional sanctions include a ban on new U.S. investment in South Africa, prohibition of the imports into the United States of coal or uranium from South Africa,

and the revocation of the most-favored-nation tariff status South Africa now enjoys with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, South Africa's practice of apartheid—institutional racism—is brutal and utterly inhumane. It is contrary to any standard of civilized society, and it must be stopped.

The Reagan administration's policy of constructive engagement is a failure. It has done nothing to ease the plight of South Africa's 22 million blacks. Rather, internal repression has escalated dramatically over the last 4 years. Black South Africans cannot vote or run for public office or have a voice in their own destiny. The South African Government's homelands policy has resulted in over 9 million black South Africans being stripped of their citizenship in the land of their own birth. The South Africa Government has increased its oppression of trade unions. Its policies have resulted in the deaths of blacks fighting for their rights and freedom. Constructive engagement has aligned the United States—our country—with the repression of white rule in the eyes of South Africa's black majority. America should stand for justice in South Africa. It is right and it will best serve our national interest.

Now South African President Botha has declared a state of emergency in that country. Repeatedly we see footage of black South Africans demonstrating for their rights and freedoms. Repeatedly we hear stories of more deaths of black South Africans, killed in the pursuit of these goals.

Mr. Speaker, as citizens of the United States, where freedom and equality are held precious and inviolable, we must support these overriding principles on behalf of an oppressed people. Black South Africans have made it clear that even if sanctions create hardships for them in the short run, they are willing to bear the burden to achieve political and economic freedom in the long run. The struggle in South Africa is not about jobs or investments, it's about justice and dignity and political freedom.

South African Bishop Desmond Tutu, recipient of the 1984 Nobel Prize for Peace, has said that no amount of repression can contain the millions of black South Africans who are determined to be free. Let us join with them and help them achieve their aspirations. Support this bill.

Thank you.●

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is now quite evident that in the past few weeks the policy of constructive engagement with South Africa has had very negative consequences. Coupled with the recent crackdown by South African authorities and the resulting deaths and arrests of South African blacks, President Reagan appears to have no choice now but to sign this historic legislation.

In conference, members of the President's own party have clearly repudiated the Reagan administration's

policy of constructive engagement by agreeing to the conference report on the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. It is now up to the whole Senate to follow the leadership of Senator LUGAR, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and put the entire Senate on record in opposition to the apartheid system.

The Senate and ultimately the President, by agreeing to and signing the bill, will usher in a new era in U.S. foreign policy. We will serve notice to the world that the United States will be willing to use economic sanctions to protect the human rights of people across the world. Clearly, the American people are making the struggle for human dignity their own struggle. Surely the President and Senate cannot ignore now the will of the American people manifesting itself in an overwhelming 380-48 repudiation of constructive engagement.

If our great Nation is committed to equality and justice, then we must honor our own standards here and abroad and immediately disassociate ourselves from the appalling system of apartheid. As Bishop Desmond Tutu, Nobel Peace Prize winner, remarked, "Economic restrictions are black South Africa's only chance. The argument that blacks would suffer most from greater economic pressure is moral humbug." Today, my colleagues, we can set into motion a forceful and realistic attack on South African apartheid. A policy that will enfranchise black South Africans with dignity and respect, and the political privileges that citizens all over the free world too often take for granted.●

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, South Africa's policy of apartheid represents vicious, institutionalized racism. It is a practice that has not ended with the administration's policy of constructive engagement. The fact is constructive engagement is a failed policy, and the time has come to stop providing support to a nation whose practices so completely belie our own democratic traditions of fairness and equality under the law. It is time to repudiate the policy of constructive engagement.

The failure of constructive engagement is evidenced by this morning's headlines. In response to increasingly vocal opposition to apartheid the white minority government of South Africa has banned outdoor funerals with any political content. Rather than working with black leaders to ease tensions, the Government has removed the only manner in which blacks were able to demonstrate their opposition to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation which will impose economic sanctions against South Africa. Economic sanctions can be a legitimate tool of foreign policy, and I am convinced that this would be an appropriate and effective means to bring about change in South Africa. It would, in any case, leave no question where the United

States stands on the abhorrent policy of apartheid.

The economic sanctions in the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985 are just and represent a critical first step in disassociating the United States from the cruel and racist policies of South Africa. I urge adoption of this legislation.●

● Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again express my deep concern that our Government recognize the brutality endemic to the apartheid regime in South Africa, and that we as a nation abandon, without further delay, our policy of constructive engagement.

Mr. Speaker, France, Canada, and other members of the world community of nations are taking firm and unequivocal stands in response to Pretoria's unprecedented crackdown against the black people of South Africa. We can no longer continue to cling to a policy which has failed so completely and so tragically. South Africa must be made to understand that if it does wish to be considered a member of the western community of nations, there are certain standards which must be met. Simply claiming to be anti-Communist is not enough. If South Africa insists on its right to reject and defy all tenets of social and political justice and decency, we must insist upon our right to disassociate completely from that tyranny.

The international community is already doing precisely what I am advocating here today. France, Sweden, Canada have all taken a stand. European parliamentarians are protesting en masse.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that the United States of America not be the one country clinging tenaciously to the apartheid regime while all other nations, great and small, do their parts to hasten the dismantlement of the repulsive system.

On March 7, 1985, I introduced the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. On July 31, House and Senate conferees agreed to ban bank loans to the South African public sector, ban nuclear trade with South Africa, ban computer exports to the Government of South Africa, and end the importation of South African Krugerrands into this country.

Constructive engagement clearly reflects neither the will of the American people nor the rising international tide in opposition to apartheid. I commend House and Senate conferees on the leadership they have shown. I trust that this bipartisan, bicameral position makes clear the urgency of implementing a new and enlightened South African policy.●

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida, for his outstanding and effective effort in bringing legislation important to the national interest

to the floor in a timely manner. It is my understanding that over the past 2 weeks, the foreign Affairs Committee had three bills in conference simultaneously. To complicate the situation even further, it was necessary to interrupt the foreign aid conference, to take up and pass the Micronesian compact legislation. This was all accomplished smoothly.

We all owe our thanks to Mr. FASCELL, his committee, especially the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for demonstrating a true spirit of constructive bipartisanship.●

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, when the South African sanctions passed the House I voted "no." In general, I thought the motivation good, the moral statement even better, but that the results would be harmful to all parties involved, particularly the black people of South Africa.

In general, I don't like sanctions. On the record, they have not been successful. I don't like sending messages by shooting ourselves or other relatively innocent bystanders in the foot.

In general, I like the policy of constructive engagement. I believe we are more effective working with foreign governments than we are when we threaten them. I like having U.S. firms, using Sullivan principles, standing as an example and a symbol in South Africa.

But, conditions have taken us past the in general stage and the personal preference state. The situation in South Africa has worsened, and continues to do so.

The conference report has taken us past the send-a-message stage. It is a vast improvement over the previously passed House bill. Both the carrots and the 1-year stick are helpful.

It is now time for the Congress to act.

For those of us who don't like sanctions, who want to keep the U.S. presence as a symbol in South Africa, it is time to acknowledge the need for action.

There is a cost to us, and to the people, black and white, of South Africa. There are times when people of good will must accept some costs in the name of principle. One speaker today said that moral question had become predominant.

I am forced to conclude he is right. I must vote for this bill.●

● Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to participate in the conference on the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. I urge support of this most essential piece of legislation.

The sanctions that conferees agreed on against South Africa include banning the importation of Krugerrands, halting new U.S. bank loans, banning the sale of nuclear technology, applying the Sullivan principles to U.S. firms with more than 25 employees, minting new U.S. gold coins to compete with the Krugerrand, and provid-

ing \$34 million of AID funds for scholarships for black South Africans. I believe that these sanctions send a message to the South African Government that apartheid must end, that they cannot continue to oppress 23 million of its citizens. The sanctions also send a message to our Government that we don't want to be constructively engaged with a government that practices legally mandated racism.

The situation in South Africa has deteriorated drastically in the past week. Since the Government established a state of emergency 11 days ago, 25 persons have been killed and 1,259 have been arrested. In addition, a ban on outside funerals for anyone who has died of unnatural causes in any of the black townships was established today. The state of emergency grants broad powers to the South African defense force and to the South African police (including the railways police and the prisons service). Those forces are authorized to "apply * * * such force as he under the circumstances may deem necessary * * *" to prevent even a suspected danger to public order. They are authorized to arrest and detain without a warrant or charge for up to 14 days. However, that 14-day period can be extended for an indefinite period pursuant to a written notice issued by the Minister of Law and Order. Detentions under the state of emergency do not have to allow access to legal counsel or family. The names of those detained may be withheld and any unauthorized distribution of the names is punishable by up to 10 years imprisonment or a substantial fine. It is important to note that new powers are an extension of far-reaching powers authorized under preexisting statutory law. The Internal Security Act of 1982 had already given the police broad powers to curtail the civil liberties of South Africa's black citizens. The 1982 act gives a police officer of the rank of lieutenant colonel or higher the power to detain a person incommunicado for the purposes of interrogation.

The conferees agreed that President Reagan must recommend stiffer sanctions for congressional approval, if the South African Government does not take one of several steps to end its oppressive and racist system of apartheid. These sanctions include a ban on new private U.S. investment in South Africa, a denial of most-favored-nation tariff status, and a prohibition on coal, uranium, or both. The steps that would be considered progress under the conference include an end to forced relocations, negotiations for a new political system with full rights for nonwhites, a settlement of the status of South African-controlled Namibia, freedom for all political prisoners, access to jobs and joint family housing for nonwhites, and an end to denationalization practices of segregation.

I urge support for the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. The United States must take a stand against apartheid.●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support to the conference report on H.R. 1460, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. While I would wish for stronger measures, such as the imposition of an immediate ban on new investments in South Africa, I can support this bill because it is the first definitive action that this Congress has taken to express its abhorrence of apartheid.

Congress hereby states that the past pressures on the South African minority rule government have failed to effect substantive changes in that country's racist policies. In fact, many in this country and in this Congress believe that the administration's policy of "constructive engagement" has been equivalent to tacit approval of apartheid and to support for Mr. Botha's white-supremacist rule.

The increasing violence and unmitigated police brutality in South Africa show us that the situation is becoming worse. The state of emergency imposed by Pretoria demonstrates that the government plans to deal with the rising level of anger in the black community by implementing more repressive policies and by arresting opposition figures. Yesterday's new ban on mass outdoor funerals, the only means for blacks in South Africa to express dissent, makes this legislation most timely.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves our strong support. It is a long overdue change in our policy toward South Africa. The Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985 signifies unequivocally the beginning of the end of the fruitless policy of "constructive engagement."●

● Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, over the past few months we have seen America's attention focused on two crises in Africa. In sub-Saharan Africa we have witnessed the starvation of hundreds of thousands of people who have had their lives devastated by the worst that nature has to offer, and America has responded.

Even as we are helping to feed starving people in Africa we have been witnessing another disaster. This disaster represents the worst that man has to offer. The present Government of South Africa survives on the basis of a repugnant system of racial servitude. Again America is responding. The frustration and anger of the American people is represented in this legislation. These economic sanctions passed by the House and Senate are the first step in using America's influence to end the system of apartheid. We realize that total change will not occur overnight. But this measure will send a clear message to South Africa and also put them on notice that the United States intends to exert whatever pressure it is capable of.

This antiapartheid legislation is a first step; it is by no means the final

action. No matter what it takes—complete economic isolation, severance of diplomatic relations, and the cessation of all political contacts between our country and South Africa—apartheid must end.

This legislation is also warning to the Reagan administration. While black South Africans are being murdered and imprisoned on a daily basis, President Reagan continues to stand by his bankrupt policy of constructive engagement. The Reagan administration knows that it cannot maintain this policy.

Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake about what we are doing here today. We are taking a largely symbolic but important action step. But this is not the end of our pressures against the racist apartheid regime in South Africa; this is the beginning of the end of apartheid.●

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, the House overwhelmingly approved the conference report on the Anti-Apartheid Act. It eventually will be approved by the Senate as well. While the act, as agreed to by the House and Senate conferees, is not as strong as some of us would have liked, it represents the best legislative proposal that could be obtained at this time.

Economic sanctions, at times, are more symbolic than effective. The Anti-Apartheid Act, a highly bipartisan measure, is important in that it signals to the world community and Pretoria that the Congress and the American people are committed to severing its relationship with, and support of, the most racist government on the planet. We want South Africa to open its doors of freedom to all of its citizens.

More importantly, the overwhelming support for the Anti-Apartheid Act signals to the Reagan administration that the constructive engagement policy has not only been a failure, but it has resulted in South Africa believing that the United States, while giving lipservice to apartheid, encourages for South Africa to conduct business as usual. Why should South Africa change its racist policies when it feels it has the backing of the most powerful government in the world?

Constructive engagement has permitted the United States to become the largest trading partner and second-largest foreign investor in South Africa. It also has become a toothless euphemism disguising military, economic, and diplomatic support to Pretoria which, until recently, has gone almost totally unnoticed.

Late last year, the Free South Africa Movement began; members of the Congressional Black Caucus and other Members of Congress were arrested almost daily at the South Africa Embassy. These arrests were instrumental in bringing the apartheid issue, which has existed for well over a century, to the front burner. Since that time, hundreds of thousands of Americans

have, in a variety of ways, joined in showing their disapproval of South Africa's policies, and the administration's policy of passivity.

In fact, at this very moment, a large protest march is occurring in Detroit in which its citizens, as they have in the past, are again demanding an end to the terror in South Africa and responsible action from our Government in Washington.

Constructive engagement has resulted in the loss of over 500 lives in South Africa during the past year; additionally, thousands of innocent people being arrested. It has provided the minority government in South Africa with the boldness to thumb its nose at the world community, and impose incredible restrictions on 24 million individuals because they happen to be black.

Considering the events of the past several months in South Africa, where blacks have been brutally murdered by the South African police while attending funerals of others who also have been killed by the police, the administration should have taken the initiative to declare its constructive engagement policy toward South Africa ineffective and inefficient, and a total failure. Perhaps the actions that the Congress has taken today will cause the administration to reexamine its attitude to South Africa.

This is the same administration which so eagerly provided military and CIA support to rebels committed to destroying the current government which came to power as the result of overthrowing the infamous Somoza dictatorship. In fact, many of the rebels are former members of the Somoza regime. Recently, the administration has declared the Nicaraguan government a threat to our national security, and had no problems imposing economic sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is a very precious thing, and people will do anything to get it. Time is growing short for South Africa to peacefully end its apartheid system. In fact, one might say the revolution has already begun. Our American Revolution was started over the issue of freedom, and once it started there was no way of stopping it.

The burning desire for freedom stops for no one. Nor can it be stopped. Black South Africans will be free one day; it's just a matter of time. As Bishop Desmond Tutu, South Africa's 1984 Nobel Peace Prize winner, has reminded us, no amount of repression can contain 24 million people determined to be free.

There are some who say that economic sanctions will hurt South African blacks more than it will the white minority. Yet, American firms employ less than 1 percent—66,000—of South Africa's black population. Yet, American corporations control 70 percent of the computer market, 45 percent of the oil market, and 33 percent of the automotive market. These businesses

are the jugular vein of the highly sophisticated South African police state, without which Pretoria could not maintain its political and economic structure.

The House, by overwhelmingly approving the Anti-Apartheid conference report, has taken the position that it will stand on the side of freedom. I urge President Reagan to not only sign this important legislation when it reaches his desk, but to also actively support it as well, and ensure that this legislation will be enforced to the fullest extent. This is an issue which the administration can ill afford to be out of synch with the wishes of the Congress and the majority of the American people.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—yeas 380, nays 48, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—380

Ackerman	Bruce	Dowdy
Addabbo	Bryant	Downey
Akaka	Burton (CA)	Dreier
Alexander	Bustamante	Duncan
Anderson	Byron	Durbin
Andrews	Campbell	Dwyer
Annuzio	Carney	Dymally
Anthony	Carper	Dyson
Applegate	Chandler	Early
Aspin	Chappell	Eckart (OH)
Atkins	Clay	Edgar
AuCoin	Clinger	Edwards (CA)
Barnard	Coats	Edwards (OK)
Barnes	Cobey	English
Bartlett	Coble	Erdreich
Bateman	Coelho	Evans (IA)
Bates	Coleman (MO)	Evans (IL)
Bedell	Coleman (TX)	Fascell
Beilenson	Collins	Fawell
Bennett	Conte	Fazio
Bentley	Conyers	Feighan
Bereuter	Cooper	Fiedler
Berman	Coughlin	Fish
Bevill	Courter	Flippo
Blaggi	Coyne	Florio
Bilirakis	Craig	Foglietta
Bliley	Crockett	Foley
Boehert	Daniel	Ford (MI)
Boggs	Darden	Ford (TN)
Boland	Daschle	Fowler
Boner (TN)	Daub	Frank
Bonior (MI)	Davis	Franklin
Bonker	de la Garza	Frenzel
Borski	Dellums	Frost
Bosco	Derrick	Fuqua
Boucher	DeWine	Gallo
Boxer	Dickinson	Garcia
Breaux	Dicks	Gaydos
Brooks	Dingell	Gejdenson
Broomfield	DioGuardi	Gekas
Brown (CA)	Dixon	Gephardt
Brown (CO)	Donnelly	Gibbons
Broyhill	Dorgan (ND)	Gilman

Gingrich	Martin (IL)	Scheuer
Glickman	Martin (NY)	Schneider
Gonzalez	Martinez	Schroeder
Goodling	Matsui	Schulze
Gordon	Mavroules	Schumer
Gradison	Mazzoli	Seiberling
Gray (IL)	McCain	Sensenbrenner
Gray (PA)	McCloskey	Sharp
Green	McCurdy	Shaw
Gregg	McDade	Shelby
Grotberg	McEwen	Sikorski
Guarini	McGrath	Sisisky
Gunderson	McHugh	Skeen
Hall (OH)	McKernan	Skelton
Hamilton	McKinney	Slattery
Hammerschmidt	McMillan	Smith (FL)
Hatcher	Meyers	Smith (IA)
Hawkins	Mica	Smith (NE)
Hayes	Michel	Smith (NJ)
Heftel	Mikulski	Smith, Robert
Hendon	Miller (CA)	Snowe
Henry	Miller (WA)	Solarz
Hertel	Mineta	Spence
Hiler	Mitchell	Spratt
Hillis	Moakley	St Germain
Holt	Molinari	Staggers
Hopkins	Mollohan	Stallings
Horton	Montgomery	Stangeland
Howard	Moody	Stark
Hoyer	Moore	Stokes
Hubbard	Morrison (CT)	Strang
Huckaby	Morrison (WA)	Stratton
Hughes	Mrazek	Studds
Hunter	Murphy	Sundquist
Hutto	Murtha	Sweeney
Ireland	Natcher	Swift
Jacobs	Neal	Swindall
Jeffords	Nelson	Synar
Jenkins	Nichols	Tallon
Johnson	Nowak	Tauke
Jones (NC)	O'Brien	Tauzin
Jones (OK)	Oakar	Thomas (CA)
Jones (TN)	Oberstar	Thomas (GA)
Kanjorski	Obey	Torres
Kaptur	Olin	Torricelli
Kasich	Ortiz	Towns
Kastenmeier	Owens	Trafficant
Kemp	Panetta	Traxler
Kennelly	Parrisi	Udall
Kildee	Pashayan	Valentine
Kleczka	Pease	Vander Jagt
Kolbe	Penny	Vento
Kolter	Pepper	Visclosky
Kostmayer	Perkins	Volkmer
Kramer	Petri	Vucanovich
LaFalce	Pickle	Walgren
Lagomarsino	Porter	Walker
Lantos	Price	Watkins
Latta	Pursell	Waxman
Leach (IA)	Rahall	Weaver
Lehman (CA)	Rangel	Weber
Lehman (FL)	Ray	Weiss
Leland	Regula	Wheat
Lent	Reid	Whitehurst
Levin (MI)	Richardson	Whitley
Levine (CA)	Ridge	Whittaker
Lewis (CA)	Rinaldo	Whitten
Lewis (FL)	Roberts	Williams
Lightfoot	Robinson	Wirth
Lipinski	Rodino	Wise
Livingston	Roe	Wolf
Lloyd	Roemer	Wolpe
Long	Rogers	Wortley
Lott	Rose	Wright
Lowery (CA)	Rostenkowski	Wyden
Lowry (WA)	Roukema	Wylie
Lujan	Rowland (CT)	Yates
Luken	Rowland (GA)	Yatron
Lundine	Roybal	Young (AK)
Lungren	Russo	Young (FL)
MacKay	Sabo	Young (MO)
Madigan	Savage	Zschau
Manton	Saxton	
Markey		

NAYS—48

Archer	Eckert (NY)	Miller (OH)
Arney	Emerson	Monson
Badham	Fields	Moorhead
Barton	Hall, Ralph	Myers
Boulter	Hansen	Nielson
Burton (IN)	Hartnett	Packard
Callahan	Hyde	Quillen
Chappie	Kindness	Ritter
Cheney	Leath (TX)	Roth
Combest	Mack	Rudd
Dannemeyer	Marienee	Schaefer
DeLay	McCandless	Schuette
Dorman (CA)	McCollum	Shumway

Shuster	Smith (NH)	Stenholm
Siljander	Smith, Denny	Stump
Slaughter	Snyder	Taylor

NOT VOTING—5

Carr	Hefner	Solomon
Crane	Loeffler	

□ 1520

Mr. McCANDLESS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SWINDALL and Mr. LUGAN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 144, adopted earlier today.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On July 31, 1985:

H.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution designating August 1985 as "Polish American Heritage Month."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1985

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2577) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, and for other purposes; with a Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 112 thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 112, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 with an amendment as follows: After "legislation" at the end of the last sentence, insert; "except that this sentence shall not apply after May 15, 1986".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the further amendment of the Senate to the Senate amendment No. 112 to H.R. 2477.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTEL] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

May I say to my colleagues that the amendment adopted yesterday, after further study, appears to create more problems than it solved. We all agree we would prefer to have legislation authorizing projects; we all recognize that we would like to have our legislative committees doing authorizations.

May I say that we agree it would be much better if we could have authorizations and not have to proceed as we did. We are in accord with the feelings of the leadership of the legislative Committee on Public Works. As I said, the amendment adopted yesterday, upon further study, creates more problems than it solves.

The Senate, in looking it over, decided to give time for authorizations until May 15, 1986.

So what they have done is amend the provision that passed the House by adding the following words: "except that this sentence shall not apply after May 15, 1986."

So on yesterday we had a prohibition against initiating public works projects that were listed in that bill until we had legislative authorizations. May I repeat that the amendment of yesterday prohibited the initiation of construction of the projects that were listed in the bill until authorized by legislation.

It also prohibited the initiation of construction of those that had already been authorized.

In order to straighten the matter out, to give the legislative committee ample time in which to pass legislation which I hope they can do, the Senate added the following words: "except that this sentence shall not apply after May 15, 1986."